ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED001001	N.A.	File No. 4095

4. AUTHOR(S):
Havighurst, Dr. Robert J.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Social Class Influence on Learning

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
N.A.

7. EDITOR(S):
N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Great Cities School Improvement Program
ST. 453 Stimson
CITY/STATE Detroit, Michigan
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
Great Cities School Improvement Program
453 Stimson, Detroit, Michigan

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	Aug. 60	16

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☐ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☐
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
discussion

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

urban renewal	training of teachers	underprivileged	social mobility
acculturation	proper materials	work-study	economic mobility
curriculum	community improvements	elementary edu.	Detroit Great Cities
		city improvement	Great Cities Detroit

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

In an address delivered to a workshop of the Great Cities Improvement Program, it was noted that today's slums are bigger, stratification more prevalent, and that because of these factors, acculturation has been somewhat slowed down. Urban renewal cannot be successful unless schools and other community agencies assume a major part in the renewal, and schools cannot function properly unless attention is paid to the problems of structure in the city. Creation of a "glorified" slum results when people are taken out of one building and put in another in the name of urban renewal. A program for children in the early elementary grades could provide a better reading program, properly trained teachers, and materials adapted to their needs. An obligation of society is to provide work experience for some youngsters at the ages of 13 or 14. Simple work such as gardening, alley-cleaning, beach up-keep, snow removal could be instituted to improve community areas. Emphasis should be placed on punctuality, cooperativeness and a willingness to work. Students could combine their day with work and basic curriculum experiences. Jobs could be obtained for them while still in school in business or industry under the school's supervision, enabling them to graduate at 16 to full time employment. If schools will meet the needs of their children, many of today's problems in the city schools would be solved.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

SOCIAL CLASS INFLUENCE ON LEARNING

Dr. Robert J. Havighurst

An Address Delivered to
The Great Cities School
Improvement Workshop,
August 29, 1960
Detroit, Michigan

(Transcript of Tape)

ED001001

Detroit Public Schools

File No. 4095

SOCIAL CLASS INFLUENCE ON LEARNING

I am going to divide what I have to say into two parts. First, I want to talk about the city and then I am going to talk about the children.

One of the interesting books that is beginning to come out in little pieces this year is the 1960 Census. I notice that a little piece that came out in reference to Detroit caused one of the papers, maybe both of them, to editoralize on the fact that there has been a decrease in population in Detroit of 170,000 in ten years, saying that this is a matter of some concern to us. Well, the same thing is happening in a good many other places; the decrease in population in the city proper. For instance, these are the percentage decreases in population between 1950 and 1960: Baltimore - 3%; Boston - 15%; (Boston leads in percentage decrease of population among the big cities); Chicago - 3-1/2%; Cleveland - 4.9%; Detroit - 9.6% (I think Detroit is third in terms of decrease among the larger cities); Minneapolis - 7.8%; New York - 2.9%; Philadelphia - 5.4%; St. Louis - 14% (St. Louis is second to Boston); Washington, D. C. - 6.9%; Cincinnati - 3.3%. These are all decreases. In ten years these cities, that is, the part that is the city proper, has lost population. If we combine the central cities among the 189 metropolitan areas in the United States, we ask ourselves what has happened to the population of the central cities. We find that between 1950 and 1960 there was a gain of four million, that is from 51 million to 55 million. This is a rather small gain, roughly eight per cent, if you take all of the central cities of the 189 metropolitan areas. On the other hand, the suburbs, the remainder of the metropolitan areas, grew from 36 million to 53 million between 1950 and 1960. In other words, at the present time, the population of the metropolitan areas of this country is about evenly divided between the central city and the suburbs. If you add these you get 108 million, which is about two-thirds of the total population of this country. The population of this country is more and more urbanized or metropolitanized, if you can use that term, but also the rapid growth that has taken place in the suburbs and the central cities is just about static. Some have increased, some have decreased just a little bit depending largely upon whether the city limits were originally drawn like Los Angeles -- where Los Angeles does not have any suburbs because the city itself is so large -- or whether the city limits are drawn more as in the case of Detroit where there is no chance of physical expansion of the city. This is a part of the situation.

We, in America, are faced with a situation which is totally new to us and new to our way of thinking; that you can have a decrease in population in an area that is important to you. Our notion has always been that everything grows and when everything grows, you always have a chance to add new things on and not worry too much about the old because you can improve things by adding the new.

The time has come when this is no longer possible in the central cities. From now on if we improve the central cities we are going to have to make radical, basic changes. We cannot simply say, we are

going to add some good new things to the old. We are going to have to change the old in order to be able to bring in anything new.

Along with this migration to the suburbs, of course, has come an enormous growth of what I think we can realistically call slum areas. Really, we should speak of the metropolitan area as a unit. It is an economic unit. It is a unit of population. But if as a result of movement outward from the central city of people who can afford it and who particularly want to get out, you find that you double the slum population in the central city, then you find that you have got a rather significant fact on your hands and I would say that that is exactly what has been happening in many, many cities. The structure of the total population has not changed, that is; there have been well-to-do people living in various parts of this metropolitan area, there have been professional, and managerial people living in various parts, there have been skilled workers and unskilled workers. But more and more we have moved into a situation of stratification, in my judgment, a very dangerous kind of stratification. More and more, we have found the slums concentrating themselves in the central cities and the upper middle class people and even the lower middle class people are tending to concentrate themselves in the outer ring or in the suburbs. There is much more actual stratification in terms of residential arrangements and therefore in schools in the urban part of this country than there has ever been.

I do not have the facts very clearly in mind in respect to Detroit, although the Citizens' Commission which reported a couple of years ago has given some very valuable material on Detroit in this connection, but I am sure what is happening in Detroit is very much like what is happening in every other major city and I just want to read you one page from a book on New York which has just been published, called The Anatomy of A Metropolis. A regional planning council in New York City has asked a group at Harvard University to make a series of studies about the present and future of that region. These books are now out or coming out and are providing a very important base for the reorganization of metropolitan life in New York City. Now my guess is that what I am reading here about New York is just as true of Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and St. Louis as it is of New York or very nearly so.

> The inner part of the Core--Manhattan and parts of adjacent counties--is people mainly by two contrasting types of household. First, there is a preponderant mass of bottom-income unskilled manual and service workers, including most of the Region's members of "disadvantaged" recent in-migrant groups. They are there because of obsolete, dilapidated, and highly compressed housing; because their jobs are mainly in Manhattan and nearby heavy-industry zones, and the subway affords cheap access; because they are excluded from most Inner Ring suburbs by social counter-pressures as well as by lack of rock-bottom housing; and because they find some community solidarity and better job opportunity within the focal cluster and its huge and variegated labor market. The other conspicuous element in the inner Core (far smaller, and mainly confined to certain sections of Manhattan) consists of wealthy and mainly childless people in the professional and executive categories, who value quick access to their Manhattan jobs

and also the many avocational attractions of the Region's center, and who have been able to afford the high costs of luxury-apartment redevelopment.

A little farther out, in the outer parts of the Core and the most urbanized parts of the Inner Ring, the population is predominantly lower-middle in income, with both extremes underrepresented. The housing here is somewhat less old and more spacious than in the inner Core and includes some relatively new apartments. Occupationally, these communities consist mainly of lower white-collar commuters to Manhattan and semiskilled industrial workers employed in the Inner Ring and Core.

Going farther out in the Inner Ring, there is a gradual rise in income level and improvement in the newness and quality of housing, with the single-family house becoming predominant. The proportion of skilled industrial workers relative to semiskilled and unskilled rises, with a similar upward shift in the status of the white-collar groups, and a rising proportion of households with children. Interspersed in the pattern are the older, zoning-protected, upper-class suburbs populated largely by Manhattan-employed professional and executive workers.

Still farther out (in the outer parts of the Inner Ring and some of the inner edges of the Outer Ring) is a zone of active new construction, almost entirely in single-family houses on fairly ample lots. These suburbs house primarily upper-income people with children who want space and can afford new housing. A considerable proportion, by the time we reach this zone, work in the Inner Ring rather than the Core. Here are interspersed, too, some rather low-income communities (largely old industrial cities and towns), populated by unskilled manual and service workers with suburban jobs and, predominantly, with children.

I give you this much in this much detail because I think that this is the business of teachers. I think that the time has passed when we can say that urban renewal or the structure of the city is no business of the teachers. I do not think that urban renewal is going to be successful unless the schools take a major part along with other community agencies and I do not think that schools are going to function properly in a metropolis unless they pay attention to the problems of the structure of the city.

This is the proposition of the first half of my talk -- that the task of the schools in the Great Cities Project is to do something about urban renewal and conversely that the task of urban renewal is to pay some attention to the school. It has long been clear that urban renewal is not only a problem to real estate and traffic. This is just the beginning but you cannot solve the urban renewal problem with housing projects, public and private, and with traffic, and with freeways. As a matter-of-fact, there is some evidence that we have only made the problem worse by traffic arrangements in the last fifteen or twenty years. It is a kind of a human problem, a problem of human relations, that is only going to be solved by the people who work with people and the people who work with physical objects.

Well, here we are, at least in Chicago where I know the facts pretty well, in a situation where the proportion of slum dwellers in the city is about twice what it was 40 years ago. In 1920 roughly 20% of the population in Chicago were what we call lower-lower class, the lower working class, the unskilled; the somewhat disorganized people who were somewhat marginal often in the period of unemployment but nevertheless they had been brought in to do the heavy and the difficult work of the society. (About 20% because in that time Chicago had a cross section of our society.) There were areas in Chicago which were as good as areas for living as anywhere in the world, at least anywhere in that part of Lake Michigan, and in the last 40 years what has happened is that the really excellent areas for housing have largely been deserted by people in Chicago and they have moved on out. Meanwhile, the slum dwellers, the slums have increased because the total population is doubled, but the slums have been largely concentrated in Chicago so instead of 20% slums, you have closer to 40%. This is what is happening in all of the big cities. The people who move out are the people who can afford it or have the skills to get out and this leaves a concentration in the middle of the city which results in the kind of unfortunate and bad stratifications I have spoken of.

Now, we have seen through American history or the history of the last 100 years a recurrent phenomenon of immigrants coming in to man our industry through the least well paid jobs and the heaviest work. They are coming in, living in the poorest housing and so on, and then, after a generation or so, bettering themselves and moving out. We have seen this in every city. I understand that there used to be a section of Detroit called Cork-Town. I do not know whether anybody here knows anything about Cork-Town because it disappeared so long ago, but this was the Irish area when the Irish were at the bottom of the heap. Well, Irish are all through our society now. Some I guess, are still at the bottom though it's hard to find them, but plenty of them are everywhere else. Cork-Town has largely disappeared but the people who lived in Cork-Town after the Irish were sociologically the same -- only they were not Irish anymore. For awhile they were Germans but the Germans have done the same thing as the Irish. They just came in a few years later and then they dispersed themselves throughout the society. Then came the Poles, Italians and the Southeast Europeans around the period of World War I and they have gone through pretty much the same process.

I would like to know now what the proportion of Poles is in Hamtramck. I bet it is not nearly as large as many of us would suppose, thinking of it at one time as a 90% Polish community. People whose grandparents lived in Hamtramck are probably all through the suburbs of Detroit now and they may have a sentimental feeling about Hamtramck but they wouldn't want to go back there to live.

After World War I when we cut down the immigration from Europe we still had to have people to do the heavy work of the growing industry so we got a migration up from the South of white and Negro, first more rural white and then more Negro. So we see now the same process going through this group, that is the process of bettering themselves and dispersing them up through the social structure and getting better jobs. I think it is probably true this process is a little slower at present than it was earlier. Now this could be due to a number of

factors. It could be due to just the mere growth and size of the metropolitan area and I think when you double the area of slums you decrease the possibility or the speed at which the people move out of the slums. When you get a large slum area you get less opportunity somehow for people to move out. They tend to collect and stay more and in effect, at least in Chicago, we have doubled the slum area and I suspect the same thing has happened in Detroit in the last 40 years. Also, we have, of course, the factor of color which has made in somewhat more difficult. Colored people are in a disadvantage when it comes to dispersing throughout the metropolitan area and this has slowed down the process of moving out. It has only slowed it down. It is happening, of course, and it is bound to go on happening as long as people want to move out when they get into better circumstances. It takes time and I think it is probably taking a little more time now than it did when the Irish and the Germans were in the same position as the Southern Whites, the Negroes, and, in some cities, the Puerto Ricans. But it is happening! It is happening so surely and so certainly that people like ourselves are merely agents of a process that is just going on and if we won't do it somebody else will do it. Although the process can be bettered, can be speeded up, it can be made better or it can be slowed down and made worse depending on the quality of the people that do it. We are a part of a social force. We are agents of a social force that has been operating a hundred years in this society and is going to go on operating. A force for the betterment of people who come into a community or a country of opportunity but who require a generation or two in order to realize on the opportunities there. This is happening! We are a part of it! At the present time the slum dwellers are improving their situation; their children are getting more education than they got; their children are getting better positions, in most cases, than they got; their children are having more mobility in the social structure than in the past and their grandchildren even more. There is no question about this. We are just a part of a process that is working on the whole for the good but I think we have more problems as part of this process, let us say than people did in Jane Addams' day and so on, because the slums are bigger, the stratification is more prevalent in metropolitan areas and because the process of what we call aculturation, this is learning the urban ways and the ways of the middle-class people, is somewhat slowed down as compared with what it was a generation ago.

A final word about urban renewal, though I guess I am only going to repeat what I have already said but it is so important that I have to repeat it. I live in an area of urban renewal in Chicago and I see it going awfully slowly and I do not know how it is going to work. I really do not know whether it is going to succeed. Urban renewal, which consists of building public low-cost housing, has already shown that alone it does not work. This is one thing we know! You do not get urban renewal by building low-cost public housing and taking people out of bad slums and putting them into better buildings, but not changing anything else. You simply get a glorified slum.

Another aspect of urban renewal is the building of private housing, private investment in housing, single family or multiple family housing for people of higher income. This allows people to more or less suddenly find that the journey to work, if it takes an hour and a half each way, is taking a little too much of the time of each day and

so they prefer to live within walking distance or an easy bus ride from their jobs. So they come back into the inner city. This is one of the forces leading to urban renewal. These people can afford to buy and rent single family or multiple housing but if they have children they are only going to come back into the city if the schools are there for the children and the kind of school they want. Now, it is hard judgment, but the fact at present is as we all know that many people refuse to come back into the city because the schools they want are not there. This is partly because urban renewal projects are too small, that is they are small islands and they are not large enough to provide enough families with children to, in a sense, take over an elementary school. They cannot give an elementary school a kind of ethos, a middle-class ethos, which then will make it a place where these kind of people want to send their children and incidentally, in my judgment, a better place for slum dwelling children. You may want to argue with me about that, but my feeling is than an American school with a middle-class ideology, if it is an enlightened middle-class ideology, is the best kind of school for all kinds of people in this country. The problem is to change a school which has become a slum school with all that implies, into a school that all kinds of people will send all kinds of children to. I do not know for sure how it is in Detroit but I bet that it is just like it is in Chicago -- people are thinking twice and three times and then not coming back in if they have children of school age because they are not convinced that the schools are going to serve them adequately. Or maybe they are coming in for the elementary school because you get a large enough urban renewal area to make over a particular elementary school -- particularly if the school board goes along with you and builds the new school in that area. Perhaps they come back with young children and then they find that the high school is not working (the high school draws from a much bigger district which cannot be remade at least very quickly in middle-class terms again), and so they move out again. I talk with people in the Chicago area and they say, "Well, I've either got to find a private school for my high school youngster or I've got to move out to a suburb because I don't believe that my youngster can go to that high school and still get into college." "I don't believe he can go to high school and have the kind of social life I want, etc." These people may often be wrong but I've seen very conscientious and very liberal people saying the same things and making the same decisions -- moving out to the suburbs because the schools are not supported as they see it should be in a program of urban renewal. So urban renewal is something more than physical renewal. It is a kind of moral and social renewal of a city which all of us have got to work at, particularly the people in the areas we call Community Organizations or Community Services and in the schools. We have had, in many cities, an unfortunate gulf between the schools on the one hand who say our job is confined within the four walls of the school and the community agencies on the other hand and the group that feel that they do not need community welfare services on the other hand. These three groups have really got to get together and work out the problem if we are going to re-create in this country an inner city in which all kinds of people want to live and raise all kinds of children. That is the first part of my talk.

The second part deals with the children of the Great Cities.

We can take it as a basic proposition that boys and girls who are growing up properly cause only a normal amount of trouble to themselves and to the people around them, a tolerable amount of trouble and a lot of happiness to themselves and to the people around them if they are growing up successfully. And we can also take the converse of that proposition, that if boys and girls are not growing up successfully all kinds of troubles ensue. You can hardly imagine the kinds of trouble that does not happen in an area where boys and girls are not growing up successfully. All the talk about juvenile delinquency as being caused by comic books or caused by lack of recreational facilities, or caused by poor heredity and things like that are all really beside the point. The real point is that wherever you have juvenile delinquency or any other thing that is symptomatic of social pathology, you have youngsters who are not growing up properly. In the past in our society there have been at least three avenues of growth that were open to boys and girls.

One avenue lay in the home and stayed in the home. This was particularly open to girls who after a certain amount of schooling learned the rest of the important lessons of life in their home or in some other homes like their homes and eventually were ready for marriage and simply went into marriage and set up their own homes. In the rural parts of the country as late as 1910 more than half of our boys and girls could grow up by staying at home. School dwindled off and the boys moved into a work role and could either work on the home farm or someone else's farm until they were ready to take more responsibility themselves in the work role as farmers. That channel as we know it has dwindled. We have the homes but the homes are not as adequate pathways to adulthood anymore for very many people in our society.

The second pathway was through the economy, that is through jobs, through work. In 1920 in Chicago 48% of the boys aged 14-17 were employed. In 1910 10% of the boys aged 14-17 were employed, and I suppose it is no more than that now and of course many of these are part-time jobs. It has just become almost impossible for a youngster to quit school and then shift from school over to this other pathway of growth through work. In fact, we know that the ones who quit school are the ones who have the most trouble getting jobs. So that the school drop-out, instead of being able to shift over into another pathway and then to grow up through the pathway of work, the work experience, when he quits school finds that he is going nowhere. He has got nowhere to go. So the avenue of growth which was open as late as 1920 and began to close up around 1930 with community pressure, that avenue of growth to adulthood has been just about stopped in our society. It has been stopped because we have become a more efficient society. Our economy has become more efficient and we have fewer juvenile jobs. Juvenile jobs do not pay the employer very well, so the jobs that we formerly gave to juveniles just don't exist anymore. In so far as they do exist they tend to go to the most able and lively and enterprising boys and girls and these are the ones who don't need them in the sense of needing them as a pathway for growth, but they qualify because they do a better job. So that if you actually look and find out what high school youngsters are employed part time you find that the ones who are doing best in school are employed part time rather than the ones who are doing worse in school.

The other channel, of course, is school and college. This has become more and more the avenue of growth to adulthood in our society. Now this would be fine if school and college provided an adequate avenue for all kinds of boys and girls, but everybody knows they do not. Nobody who is at all realistic can pretend that it is possible for all kinds of boys and girls in our society to grow up successfully by staying in school and many of them going on to college. It is just impossible and that is why we get the drop-outs. I do not think that we need to have 35% drop-outs before high school graduation, which is what we get now, but I do not forsee a time when we will have less than 20% drop-outs -- if we define a drop-out as somebody who drops out of school before reaching 18 or before high school graduation. We now have between 35-40% drop-outs, more boys than girls, 40% boys and maybe 33-34% girls.

Now from here on I want to discuss a sub-group of youngsters, a large sub-group of youngsters, who make up roughly half of the total population. These are the children of working class families. These are the children of people who work with their hands and in sociological terms come from either the upper-lower or the lower-lower classes and make up 50-60% of our societies child problems. I don't mean here to say that children of middle-class and upper-class families do not present any problems, obviously they do, both to the teacher and to the parents and communities, but the kind of problem they present is much different and quantitatively not very large. They are socially not nearly as important as the kind of problem that we face in our society with the children of working class families.

I am going to divide these children into three groups. First, I am going to call them the more successful half -- I will not call them the better half, that is rather a value judgment I do not want to make -- but the more successful half as far as school is concerned. The more successful half are being well served by schools in most places. They are getting along all right. Most of them graduate from high school and many of them go to college. It is a great thing about our society that something like 20% of the upper working class youngsters now enter college. There is no other society that approaches this except possibly the Russian society where we do not have very good data on this question. So about half of this group do fairly well. The only places where they probably do not do as well as we would like are in these concentrated slum areas in the cities, concentrated slum areas where the youngsters come from families which do not have the know-how for urban living. They do not themselves set an example of reading, using books, etc. While these youngsters have done fairly well in school, they are not behavior problems and they get the better half of the grades; any system of objective testing shows that these youngsters are not doing as well as we think they should be doing. For instance, if you take the slum areas of the big cities and you give an intelligence test you will find an average I.Q. of around 90-95. Now some people say that is just the way it is --, survival of the fittest, these people are just eugenically not so bright. I think this is not true. I think that these youngsters given better opportunities at home in the early years would show the same average I.Q. as the rest of the society. But in any case we do know that on intelligence tests and on tests of achievement in arithmetic, etc., they are below par, even the better half are below par.

I think this is because they come from culturally deprived families and communities. Thus, a school which gives them as much attention as it gives to the children of a middle-class family is going to find that they do not perform as well because while the school may give the same amount of attention, the family and community is not giving the same amount of constructive assistance and therefore the child is not going to perform as well either on the achievement test or on the intelligence test. Here we have, fortunately now, a dramatic example of what happens if the school throws more of its weight into this situation, namely, the Higher Horizons Project in New York City, Public School 43, Manhattanville Junior High School, which is now being expanded to many more schools in New York City. I am not going to take much time on this because actually I know I will be repeating myself from the talk I gave last spring here where I describe that project somewhat and I believe there are copies of that on the table so if anybody does not know much about this and wants to at least get an introduction, just pick up a copy of my talk last spring, but in general, here is what happened.

From the feeding elementary schools, schools feeding into Manhattanville Junior High School in New York, teachers were asked to name youngsters who were doing pretty well in school regardless of their I.Q. and were encouraged to name them quite liberally. The result is they got around half of the names of the incoming seventh graders who were selected by teachers as ones who were pretty good risks for school work. Then the Junior High and later the Senior High into which this Junior High feeds, George Washington Senior High, simply spent more money and time on these youngsters than they had been doing in the past. It gave them smaller classes, it used a fleet of school busses to give them trips, to various interesting and useful places in the community. It spent a lot of time with families and family counseling and parent meetings and did all of the things that made some sense to do. Some record was then kept of the educational progress of this group. They did not have a control group that they could compare with strictly, but fortunately they had the older brothers and sisters. They knew the records of the older brothers and sisters and also they knew in general what the expectations were in Manhattanville Jr. High and George Washington Sr. High. They realizdd that a major transformation was taking place. These youngsters were doing much better in school on achievement tests. They were showing a much greater advance than others of their ages in other parts in the community. They were staying in school longer, and actually 46 of this initial group entering the Junior High entered college; whereas, if the original situation had been allowed to go on not more than two or three would have entered college. We determine this from the fact that almost none of the older brothers and sisters entered college. I think the 46 that entered college had an eighth grade I.Q. which is an average of 93.7. There is a sub-group of 20 that had an eighth grade I.Q. below 90 who entered college and they have been watched very carefully to see how they get along. They just finished the freshman year and I have not seen a report on the first year in college of these people. We know that intelligence tests penalize lower-class children. The scores of lower-class children on intelligence tests are lower than the actual running ability and so if you ask the teachers to pick the ones who are the brightest as far as the teacher can tell, what is actually happening is that the teacher is presenting you with a group of young-

sters who are at least 10 points higher (in what I might call real I.Q.) than what the test shows. So all that the schools did in this case was treat these youngsters as though they had ability and they proved that they had learning ability. There is no question, if you take the better half of any slum population (better half in terms of how well they have succeeded in school the first five or six years) you have an awfully good group to work with. You have a group that will flourish when you give them some kind of intelligent special attention. The New York situation was a good test because these youngsters were almost entirely Negroes and Puerto Ricans, the ones who would, presumably, present the most difficulty in terms of making use of educational opportunities. So that is one group, what I call the better half of this working class population.

Now I am going to divide the other half into two sub-groups, about even, although this will vary from one community to another and from one kind of education program to another.

There is a group who have not been doing well in school and therefore would not be selected by the teachers as ones to have special advantages but nevertheless get through these next years from the age of 13 to 18 and by 18 have achieved a fairly stable young adulthood and this is roughly 1/4 of this group -- this lower half in school adjustment. Let me give you an example of this from a study my colleagues and I have been making in a community of only 43,000 because you find these phenomena in communities as small as this and from communities of this size on up.

This is a boy whom I will call Roy. At the 6th grade we used a socio-metric test in that community in which we got a score on each person with regard to his standing in the eyes of his peers on three things. One was social leadership -- was he a person that other people looked to as a leader?; the second was aggressive maladjustment -- was he a person who had a reputation of fighting, of being mean, biting, etc.?; and the third was withdrawal maladjustment -- did he have a reputation of being shy, timid, fearful unable to even recite on what he did know? We got this from age-mates through a socio-metric test and we also got it from teachers through what we call the behavior description chart, a teacher rating instrument. There was a fairly high correlation between the position of these youngsters on these variables assumed by age-mates and assumed by teachers and we could use either score or make a combination of the two to select these youngsters. Now this boy, Roy, was at the very top in aggressive maladjustment seen by teachers and seen by age-mates. Actually, we sent someone around to interview the families and also the youngsters who were very high in these characteristics, both maladjusted and adjusted, and I remember the interview with Roy ran something like this:

The interviewer was a fellow who got along well with all kinds of people and did not pass judgment on them, but just let them talk freely.

He said, "Roy, whom do you like best among your teachers?" This was when Roy was about in the 9th grade and just ready to quit school.

Roy said, "Well, I don't remember any I like best but I can tell you whom I liked least. I least like that fellow Sanders, or whatever the name was." He said, "I remember him when I was in the 6th grade and I had my first run-in with him. He was a kind of assistant principal in the school and the principal had sent some of us down to change some chairs on the gym floor and after we finished that we started shooting baskets and this fellow, Sanders, came around and told us to get off because we had shoes on. But we knew that everybody shoots baskets there with shoes on or off, so I told him that anytime he would enforce this rule on everybody then I would get off. He grabbed me by the arm and twisted me and I got sore and I pushed him and he fell down three steps. Then I went to the principal and I said, 'You take him off of me or I won't be responsible for what I do to him.' The next Halloween somebody threw paint on his car and he blamed me. It wasn't really me, it was some of the most sissyfied kids in school that did it."

So you can see how this boy might well have had a reputation of being aggressive in the eyes of teachers and in the eyes of age-mates. He quit school. He had an I.Q. of about 85 and a rather severe reading disability and they tried remedial reading at about the 6th grade but gave up. He gave up and they gave up. So he was not learning anything the last two or three years in school. He was just existing in school until he became 16 and dropped out.

He got a job in a laundry and worked for about a month until he got a little job working on a construction gang, an unskilled job but a little better paying job. He stayed on that job on the construction gang contrary to what most of these youngsters do. He stayed! He made good! The foreman then began to encourage him a little and said, "Now I am going to let you work with the carpenter on this gang and if you can learn some of these things, why eventually you may become a carpenter yourself." At the age of 18 he married a girl age 17 and by age 19 this boy had settled down, had a youngster and settled down to a rather stable life and as his pay had gone up a little bit, was a kind of semi-skilled carpenter by this time.

Now here is an example of a youngster who looked as though he would give you a rather bad prognosis at the 6th or 7th grade; highly aggressive, not learning in school, but who, nevertheless, works through these next years. For all of his aggressiveness this boy had no police records. We interviewed him in the home and we began to see why. The home itself was a solid stable home. A lot of affection. The boy was pretty much following the pattern of the father who was a rather profane, tough guy who himself was a construction worker but who had a lot of affection for the boy and had given him a fair amount of licking, but not too much, and treated him as a boy who needed to be looked after somewhat. I remember that the father had some ducks in a little pond in the backyard when the interviewer came around. The interviewer said, "What have you got them for?" He said, "Well, in hunting season I use them for decoys." The interviewer said, "Isn't that against the law?" He said, "Sure it is against the law but if you want ducks you got to use these." Furthermore, he had a lot of fish nets hanging around over the back fence. He did a fair amount of fishing and again he took the fish when he could get them, regardless of the law. This man was not a man who respected the law

particularly and I do not think the boy, Roy, will be, but the kind of senseless, wild delinquency of adolescence that you might expect of this boy, he did not show. He did show that hot temper and when he got pushed too far he fought out against it but there was enough control apparently built into this boy by an essentially stable home that he got through. I think that this is roughly a half of this lower half that I am talking about who have stable enough homes, yet they are going to cause a great deal of trouble in the school unless the school can do a better job for them and I think it can. I will come back to this in a moment -- how I think it can do a better job.

Now I want to speak about the other quarter, the other half of the lower half. These are the real sources of trouble. This is a group who also show by the 4th, 5th, or 6th grade clear signs of social maladjustment. They are either highly aggressive or they are highly withdrawn, passive and fearful. Some one and some the other. They have quit learning in school. Most of them are reading very poorly and reading, I think, is probably the original seed of the difficulty in most of these youngsters and from about the 7th grade on they are sources of tribulation to everybody they come in contact with in the school. Most of them get into trouble with the police and begin to build up a court record. It is in this group that you get the majority of delinquency, more than the majority, the preponderance of delinquency. The statistics are very clear about this. Wherever you take a particular age group and follow them through school you find the delinquency is concentrated in this group of about 15%; that is, of a half of the lower half. You have say 60% working class, 30% are doing reasonably well, anyway; 15% will stumble through because of basically good conditions in the home, good emotional conditions; and the other 15% are the ones I am talking about now. These are the ones where you have 3/4 of the delinquency. I can give you the figures on the communities I have been working on and figures from other communities are very similar. A heavy concentration of official delinquency is in this 15% of the age group. For them school is clearly no place to grow up and they are showing it by being behavior problems of one kind or another. School as we now have it is clearly no place to grow up and yet they have to stay in school until they are 16 or so and then they drop out and these are the ones who then are unemployed. They are no good for the army either. I have seen record after record of this kind of youngster. If he does get into the army by the time he is 17 he is back in three months with a discharge because the army could not make anything of him. The army does not regard itself as a reform organization, so that there is really nothing in our community for this kind of person. He has a hiatus from 16 to 18 or 19 where he is unemployed more than he is employed, yet he wants to grow up and what does he do? He looks for the symbols of growing up. He cannot get at the substance and what are the symbols? Having a car that you paint a flashy color and strip down. Having money to spend on girls and with boys. Being aggressive toward the ones who are doing better in school, lording it over them, showing them that you are tougher than they are and therefore somehow more masculine and more grown up and so on. You get a collection of symptoms of manhood which are not the real things but which are all these youngsters collect for themselves because they cannot get the real thing. (The real thing being growth toward an adult role which for them is a work role.) They tried to get jobs, they lose their jobs. If they get them at all they

lose them. You get a sequence of part-time and casual jobs and eventually this kind of youngster is likely to give up getting jobs and become a member of the gang. He then uses his free time, which is all of his time now, in some kind of delinquent behavior of one kind or another unless somehow you get a city agency to train people to work with gangs. The basic problem here is these people have too much free time and no role, no adult role, that they are working for and so they are acting naturally, nothing but natural. What they are doing is just the natural same thing that you or I would have done if we had been that age and the things our children would do if they were in that box. For them, I am speaking mainly of boys although there is a variant in this kind of program for girls that I will not have time to get into this morning. It seems clear to me that we must create a channel, a pathway of growth through work experience. I mean create it, we will not discover it. The discovery has gone about as far as it can go in a place like Detroit where there has been a lot of very good work devoted to finding jobs for these youngsters. In fact, there has been some creation in Detroit because of your job finding, job improving program, actually creating jobs in community agencies and paying youngsters outside of the labor market and I think this has to be done on a much larger scale. My judgment here is that you have to start this process earlier than 16. This is a crucial point, and we have to start it at 13 or 14. We have to create work experiences for these youngsters as their right because they have as much right. I would say these youngsters are as entitled to work experiences as your son or daughter or mine has a right to schooling experience. The society has the same obligation to give them a chance to grow up as our children grow up and since they do not grow up well through the school, they must find another pathway and in effect this means institutionalizing a kind of work experience at the expense of the society. There is no reason that the economy should have to pay for this except through taxes, no reason that you should count on a few tender-hearted employers to create jobs for these people. This will not be a large enough group. Somehow the society has got to make it an obligation of society to give work experience to these youngsters, starting as early as 13 or 14.

I see here a three stage process. The first stage consisting of simple gang work with boys in gangs of 20 or so, whatever size gang turns out to be workable, at community up-building, community improving, social improvement projects, all the way from better landscaping, better care of the school grounds (which you can do by adding gangs of boys at this age to the present school personnel) to alley cleaning details, to snow removal details when you get a bad snow in the winter, to beach up-keep details, etc. Socially valuable work which would not get done otherwise. I am often asked whether you should pay these youngsters and I say "yes" if that is the way to do it. I do not see any reason why they could not be paid a dollar a week if it would give some status to the situation. But in any case I see about 15 to 20% of the boys needing this at the age of about 13 or 14 for half of the school day. The other half would be a simplified basic academic curriculum adjusted to their learning level. This would be under trained school personnel and the boys would be graded on such things as punctuality, ability to take orders from a foreman, cooperativeness, etc. These are the things that these youngsters need. These youngsters do not know how to be punctual. They do not know how to take orders from

a foreman. They do not know how to work with other people. This is not vocational training in any special sense. This is basic education for work and after a year or so of this they would then be ready for the second step which is an individual job in industry or business obtained for them by the school, still under close supervision of school personnel. They are now 15 or 16, and they then work through this, again graded appropriately, and if they graduate from this successfully they are then ready for a full-time job sometime after 16. If they want to quit school they can because they are now ready for an adult work role. There is now a variety of experiences that has continuity that starts at the time these youngsters quit learning in school and become a major problem in school and gives them an alternative pathway for growth. I do not see any alternative to this. It is radical in a way because we have always had the notion that jobs are always something you have had to go out and get in competition with other people in a market where there were not always enough jobs. We have to change our basic approach in that connection. Many people are saying this now. I am interested that the former National Child Labor Committee, recognizing that its role had become obselete (that is its role of keeping youngsters out of jobs), has now changed its name to the National Committee on Youth Employment and recognizes that their task now is to help people get employment and get the right kind of employment. This indicates, as I see it now, just the kind of switch that our society has to make. Work is a good thing for boys and girls, especially boys, and those who are not doing well in school have a right to this pathway for growth. I think we could reduce in a generation the 15 or 20% for whom this program is applicable by doing a better job with these same youngsters earlier; that is in Kindergarten or first grade. (Here I am repeating again what I said this Spring but it is essential to my argument.) My opinion on this is that there is such a thing as getting over a reading hurdle in the first grade or some time around that time. Somehow most youngsters around the age of six or maybe seven and some of even at five, learn what it means to read. They do not read with great fluency but they master the reading task, and from this time on you cannot stop them. All you have to do is give them appropriate reading material and they just move right on. I think that a considerable group, particularly ones from underprivileged homes, culturally underprivileged homes, never get over that hump. They may even stay a third semester in the first grade without getting over it. Eventually they are passed into the second grade where the teacher treats them as though they had learned to read and these four or five now in this room of 35 or so are allowed to exist. The teacher does not pay much attention to them and so they stumble through the second grade without having mastered the task of reading. They are passed into the third grade, meanwhile, falling further and further back and finding various devices for seeming to read.

I think it is clear here that by catching these youngsters at Kindergarten and first grade level and putting them into some smaller group with teachers trained for this kind of work and with materials adapted to them that we would probably cut in two the number which we now have who need this kind of heroic program I have defined for the seventh or eighth grade. I think that we would reduce by 50% the numbers who just quit learning in school, if we spent an extra few dollars and some extra time on a better reading-training program at the first grade level.

I am told by Kindergarten and first grade teachers that they can spot these youngsters. Teachers are convinced that they can spot these youngsters who are not ready for reading. A home visit will usually show that the home itself is not giving any example of parents reading. So I do not think it would be too hard to find these youngsters before the end of the first grade and one would not have to wait until they failed. One could actually find them in the process and maybe prevent failure even at the end of the first grade. There has been enough experience now with experiments at throwing more resources into work at this level to indicate that this is clearly the most efficient way to spend money if we are going to reduce social pathology in our society. We will not eliminate it but I am convinced we could reduce by 50% the number of boys and girls who now are problems in junior and senior high if we spend a little more time and money more wisely in the first grade on these youngsters. If you do not get over this hump you are in for a series of frustrations, of failures which accumulate and by the 5th or 6th grade a youngster is either going to react to this cumulative frustration and failure by becoming aggressive and hostile or by becoming withdrawn and passive and giving up; one or the other. And so you have these two groups of maladjusted youngsters.

So it seems to me that it is fairly clear what we can do, in general terms, to do a better job with the youngsters who come from these concentrated, underprivileged, deprived slum areas in our cities. We can do a better job by them in the schools and at the same time (I go back to my first proposition) you have got to work with urban renewal forces to create a new pattern, a new physical pattern, in the center of the city which permits all kinds of people to come back and live in this community and we have got to create schools which are right for them. If we have schools that are right for them we are already going to solve to some extent some of the problems I have indicated of these slow-learning slum youngsters, but we will still have to keep an eye on them, I am convinced. I am not here arguing that we create middle-class islands exactly. I am arguing that we create cross-sectional islands of our society in the center of the city where all kinds of people live; and where schools which do have a strong academic emphasis have a chance to succeed, and where high schools with a strong academic or college preparatory emphasis have a chance to succeed.